

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,927	TAKEUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marissa Thein	3627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Marissa Thein. (3) Ryan Zeender.
 (2) Mr. Todd Baker. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 November 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: 2003/0105641 to Lewis and 4,993,753 to Weeks.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marissa Thein
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Baker discussed the invention and the main points of the invention. He further discussed Claim 10 and how it differs from the cited references, Lewis and Weeks. Examiners then pointed out indefinite recitation in claim 10. He proposed in amending the claim to overcome the indefiniteness and to further distinguish ticket printing from the processing of the product sales data. He further proposed in invoking 112, sixth paragraph, which the Examiner believes will overcome the references.